DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 373 382 CS 508 685

AUTHOR Thomas, Richard W.; Seibold, David R.
TITLE Interpersonal Influence and Alcohol-Related Interventions in the College Environment.
PUB DATE Jul 94
NOTE 48p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the International Communication Association (44th, Sydney, New South Wales, Australia, July 11-15, 1994).
PUB TYPE Speeches/Conference Papers (150) -- Reports - Research/Technical (143)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Alcohol Abuse; *College Environment; Communication Research; *Driving While Intoxicated; Higher Education; *Interpersonal Communication; *Peer Influence; Sex Differences; *Undergraduate Students
IDENTIFIERS *Communication Strategies

ABSTRACT

A study examined the interpersonal influence strategies reported by college students in two alcohol-related situations--a drunk driving intervention situation and a non-driving alcohol abuse situation. Subjects, 489 undergraduate students attending a large midwestern university, a large central midwestern university, or a mid-sized upper midwestern university, completed a 5-part questionnaire. Results indicated that: (1) students employed a variety of influence tactics when attempting to intervene in alcohol-related situations; (2) these influence strategies varied in their degree of assertiveness; and (3) students' employed multiple influence attempts in order to achieve their goal. Analyses also provided support for two hypotheses: college students reported using positively valenced strategies far more frequently than negatively valenced strategies, especially in initial intervention attempts; and negatively valenced strategies were more successful in gaining compliance from the target than were positively valenced strategies. Examination of situational and individual difference factors affecting strategy usage revealed that gender of both the influence agent and the influence target significantly impacted strategy usage, especially in initial intervention attempts, and that the goal of the influence attempt rather than the situation in which the intervention occurred contributed more to influencers' use of strategies across intervention attempts. Findings suggest that college students are faced with decisions to intervene in alcohol-related situations quite frequently, that they choose to help their drinking peers in many instances and that persistence in the influence process is important. (Contains 113 references and 13 tables of data.) (Author/RS)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED 373 382

Interpersonal Influence and Alcohol-Related Interventions in the College Environment

Richard W. Thomas

Department of Speech Communication & Dramatic Arts
333 Moore Hall
Central Michigan University
Mt. Pleasant, MI 48859
(517) 774-3262

David R. Seibold

Department of Communication
1832 Ellison Hall
University of California-Santa Barbara
Santa Barbara, CA 93106-4020
(805) 393-4479

Paper Presented to the Health Communication Division at the
International Communication Association Convention
Sydney, Australia.
July, 1994

CS508685

Running Head: INTERPERSONAL INFLUENCE

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)
☑ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.
☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.
• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY
R. Thomas
TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Interpersonal Influence and Alcohol-Related Interventions in the College Environment

Abstract

This study examined the interpersonal influence strategies reported by college students in two alcohol-related situations. Based on survey responses, this study identified and classified the intervention strategies employed by college students (RQ_1), and tested the hypotheses that positively valenced strategies would be preferred over negatively valenced strategies (H_1), and negatively valenced strategies would be more successful in gaining compliance of influence targets than positively valenced strategies (H_2). In addition, situational and individual difference factors affecting strategy usage were explored (RQ_2). Results indicated that (a) students employed a variety of influence tactics when attempting to intervene in alcohol-related situations, (b) these influence strategies varied in their degree of assertiveness, and (c) students' employed multiple influence attempts in order to achieve their goal. Analyses also provided support for both hypotheses: (1) college students reported using positively valenced strategies more frequently than negatively valenced strategies, especially in initial intervention attempts, and (2) negatively valenced strategies were more successful in gaining compliance from the target than were positively valenced strategies. Examination of situational and individual difference factors affecting strategy usage revealed that gender of both the influence agent and the influence target significantly impacted strategy usage, especially in initial intervention attempts, and that the goal of the influence attempt rather than the situation in which the intervention occurred contributed more to influencers' use of strategies across intervention attempts. Results are discussed in terms of an interpersonal influence model of alcohol-related intervention processes.

Interpersonal Influence and Alcohol-Related Interventions in the College Environment

Introduction

Recent research in both the alcohol and health communication literatures have expressed increased concern with college students' potentially excessive drinking patterns and the serious consequences associated with alcohol use (Globetti, Haworth-Hoeppner, & Marasco, 1988; Hirshorn, 1987; Monto, Newcomb, Rabow, & Hernandez, 1992; Seibold & Thomas, in press; Thomas & Seibold, 1993b). Current studies estimate that 60-90% of college students consume alcohol on a regular basis with as many as 33-65% of students consuming alcohol at levels considered to be excessive (Baer, Stacy, & Larimer, 1991; Block & Ungerlieder, 1986; Heck, 1988; Rapaport, 1986). Researchers also note that college students who engage in a "binge" pattern of drinking do so with the primary goal of becoming intoxicated (Baer et al., 1991; Brennen, Walfish, & AuBuchon, 1986a, 1986b; Burnham & Nelson, 1984). In fact, studies indicate that as many as 21% of college students drink to intoxication several times a week (Berkowitz & Perkins, 1986). Not surprisingly, these consumption patterns contribute to a number of serious personal, relational, academic, and legal problems for college students (Globetti et al., 1988; Rapaport & Look, 1987; Rapaport, Cooper, & LeeMaster, 1984; Seay & Beck, 1984).

This frequent and excessive use of alcohol on college campuses produces a dangerous environment, both for the students who participate in the drinking culture and for those who may be affected by the behavior of their drinking peers. In many cases, what college students define as "social drinking" is incipient of alcohol abuse problems. Based on consumption patterns and problems experienced by college students that indicate an alcohol abuse problem (e.g., memory loss, blacking out, violent relational episodes), researchers estimate that 10-20% of drinking college students are in a prealcoholic stage and will experience continued alcohol problems once they leave the college environment (Denzin, 1987; Donovan, Jessor, & Jessor, 1983; Filmore, 1975). In addition, studies reveal that as many as 60% of drinking college students drive while intoxicated at least once a year, and up to 30% drive drunk three to ten times a year (Rabow, Newcomb, Monto, & Hernandez, 1990; Rapaport et al., 1984). Both the drunk driver and the those proximal to the drinker are at risk (Block & Ungerlieder, 1986; Hickenbottom, Bissonnette, & O'Shea, 1987; Monto et al., 1992).

The problems described above present both drinking and nondrinking students with new responsibilities. Historically, college officials have been charged with resolving these problems. Through noninterpersonal (i.e., vertical, organization-based) programs focused on increasing college students' awareness of the dangers of excessive drinking, counseling those experiencing alcohol-related problems, and punishing chronic abusers, universities have attempted to promote "responsible" drinking patterns among college students (Bolton & Brownlee, 1987; Burnham & Nelson, 1984; Dean & Bryon, 1982; Gadaleto & Anderson, 1986; Magner, 1983). However, recent findings have placed in question the efficacy of this "drinker-oriented" approach (Burnham & Nelson, 1984; Lightsey & Sweeney, 1985; Nichols, Weinstein, Ellingstad, & Struckman-Johnson, 1978). Evidence now suggests that, in terms of both opportunity and effectiveness, increased peer involvement in the form of personal interventions into these alcohol-related situations is the most viable approach to many alcohol abuse problems on college campuses (Baer et al., 1991; Monto et al., 1992; Rabow et al., 1990). Viewed as a type of altruistic behavior which is "carried out to benefit another without anticipation of rewards from external sources," (Macaulay & Berkowitz, 1970, p. 3), personal intervention processes focus on the strategies and tactics students' use to regulate either the situational or dispositional drinking behavior of another student (Monto et al., 1992; Rabow et al., 1990; Seibold & Thomas, in press; Thomas & Seibold, 1993b; Wiseman, 1983).

In recent research, Thomas and Seibold (Seibold & Thomas, in press; Thomas & Seibold, 1993a, 1993b) argued that these processes parallel those found in the communication field under the rubric of compliance-gaining message behavior, and advanced a "transactional" reconceptualization of this intervention process from an interpersonal influence perspective. Specifically, they argued that the alcohol intervention situation is one which "requires an agent to make a series of decisions, to engage in a variety of communicative behaviors, and to coordinate those behaviors with the responses of the target and the demands of the situation in order to accomplish his/her goals" (Thomas & Seibold, 1993a, p. 4). On this view, investigation of alcohol intervention behavior necessitates not only the identification of the specific communication behaviors that intervention agents employ, an approach typified by most alcohol intervention and compliance-gaining studies (Seibold, Cantrill, & Meyers, in press), but also the "factors precipitating the communication behavior and the conjoint influences of each participant's actions on subsequent behaviors that--taken collectively--represent the intervention episode and the influence outcome" (Thomas & Seibold, 1993a, p. 4; also see Garko, 1990; Miller & Burgoon, 1978; Miller, Boster, Roloff, & Seibold, 1987; Newton & Burgoon, 1990). Given the importance of understanding college students' alcohol-

related intervention behaviors, coupled with the emerging emphasis on this process from an interpersonal influence perspective, our aim in this study was to examine college students' interpersonal influence behaviors in alcohol-related intervention situations and to explore situational and individual factors affecting intervention behavior. Following a review of pertinent literature and proposal of relevant hypotheses and research questions, we undertake this task by reporting findings from a survey exploring college students' intervention behaviors in two alcohol-related situations: a drunk driving intervention situation and a non-driving alcohol abuse situation.

Review and Rationale

Research examining college students' intervention behaviors in alcohol-related situations suggests that college students do attempt to intervene in alcohol-related situations, particularly in drunk driving situations. Surveys of college students indicate that between 30-80% of students report having intervened in a drunk driving situation (Hernandez & Rabow, 1987; Monto et al., 1992; Rabow, Hernandez, & Watts, 1986; Rabow et al., 1990), but that only about 20-30% of students report intervening in a non-driving alcohol abuse situation (Jung, 1986).

Several studies also have indicated that students' decisions to intervene in alcohol-related situations are not spontaneous, but involve a series of steps or stages through which agents must pass in order to carry out the intervention attempt. For example, Rabow et al. (1990) constructed a stage model of the drunk driving intervention decision process. Their research and review suggested that prior to the decision to intervene, interveners: first, considered their own experience with prior DUI situations; second, evaluated the danger associated with the situation and the degree to which the potential drunk driver needed help; third, determined their ability to effectively intervene. Only then did the decision to intervene and the ensuing intervention attempt occur. Certain aspects of this process parallel what Thomas and Seibold (1993b) term the "avoidance stage": the period of time prior to the actual intervention when the agent evaluates the situation and decides whether to intervene or to avoid becoming involved. Early research in the alcohol intervention area only differentiated agents' decisions to intervene from decisions not to intervene (Beck & Summons, 1985; Hernandez & Rabow, 1987; Jung, 1986; Ness, 1985; Rabow et al., 1986). However, recent studies have identified such factors as the amount of perceived danger in the situation, the agent's perception of his or her ability to (communicatively) affect the behavior of the target, and the agent's affinity for the target as factors which affect agents' decisions to intervene (Rabow et al., 1990; Thomas & Seibold, 1993a).

Studies also have indicated that once decisions to intervene occur, a variety of features characterize agents' attempts to affect the target's behavior. Specifically, research on influence strategies employed in alcohol-related situations, although scant, has revealed that influence agents employ a variety of tactics when attempting to intervene in alcohol-related situations, that these tactics differ in their degree of assertiveness or argumentativeness and in their potential for success, and that their selection is affected by situational and individual difference factors. For example, Rabow & Hernandez (Hernandez & Rabow, 1987; Rabow et al., 1986) found that students preferred to employ "least intrusive" tactics such as asking the drunk driver not to drive, telling the drunk driver not to drive, offering to drive the individual home, and asking the individual to stay until sober. In contrast, they found that the most successful strategies were the ones which were the most assertive and most intrusive, such as physically preventing the driver from driving, taking the keys away from the driver, and threatening the driver in some fashion. Also, they found that women, more than men, reported intervening into drunk driving situations, using fewer strategies to accomplish the intervention, and having less overall success with intervention attempts

However, from a interpersonal influence perspective, these findings leave several questions unanswered. For example, in their examination of the strategies used in alcohol intervention, Seibold and Thomas (in press) questioned the degree to which the strategies identified in the studies above fully captured the array of strategies employed in intervention situations and accurately characterized intervention strategy systems. They argued that strategies such as "being driven home" did not clearly reflect the communication that might have gone along with this approach, nor were such strategies as asking the target not to drive versus telling the target not to drive clearly differentiated in terms of their degree of assertiveness. They felt that intervention strategies might better be classified into four strategy types: direct positive, direct negative, indirect, and behavioral, with specific influence tactics identified within each. Delineating strategies this way reflects the exchange and power orientations which many compliance-gaining researchers argue undergird the enactment of most influence strategies and enables researchers to examine the effects of perceived power differences (many times seen in mixed-gender interactions) on strategy selection (Garko, 1990; Marwell & Schmitt, 1967).

Furthermore, a more complete understanding of the influence process is obtained if one considers how influence agents simultaneously accomplish multiple communication objectives within a single influence episode. Several researchers have argued that influence agents must consider how to meet interpersonal objectives (maintaining a certain relationship with the

target) and identity-management objectives (negotiating specific self identities with the target) while simultaneously accomplishing their instrumental goal (see Clark & Delia, 1979; Craig, 1986; Dillard, 1990a, 1990b; Newton & Burgoon, 1990; Seibold et al., in press; Wilson & Putnam, 1990). In light of these demands placed on the influence agent, alcohol interventions involving college peers becomes a unique challenge. Accomplishment of the intervention (the instrumental goal) is paramount; yet, accomplishment of this instrumental goal has the potential of producing a highly stigmatizing and relationally volatile situation. How interactants strategically manage communication objectives simultaneously through their selection of intervention strategies has yet to be determined.

Finally, interpersonal influence researchers have underscored the importance of studying the sequential nature of the influence process and of including success measures in the analysis of influence attempts (Cantrill & Seibold, 1986; Dillard & Burgoon, 1985; Hunter & Boster, 1987; Lim, 1990; Monroe, DiSalvo, Lewis, & Borzi, 1990; Seibold et al., in press). This is particularly relevant to the alcohol intervention situation, which inherently involves resistance by the target that typically requires serial efforts at influence by agents (see Thomas & Seibold, 1993b). Compliance-gaining research suggests that, in the face of resistance, influence agents will move to increasingly more antisocial or negatively valenced strategies to ensure success (Dillard & Burgoon, 1985). Indeed, this progression of strategic moves is corroborated in the adult alcohol intervention literature (Wiseman, 1983) and alluded to in the college alcohol intervention literature in the form of behavioral strategies (i.e. strategies which forcibly gain compliance from the target). However, although studies have indicated that these behavioral strategies--while the least likely to be used--are the most successful (Hernandez & Rabow, 1987), sequencing of their use in alcohol interventions has not yet been studied.

Based on previous research underscoring the strategic nature of interventions in alcohol-related situations, the content of those strategies and their valence, and the sequential character of influence attempts, the following research questions and hypotheses are addressed in this research:

RQ1: What influence strategies and tactics do college students employ to intervene in alcohol-related situations?

H1: Positively valenced strategies/tactics will be preferred over negatively valenced strategies as first choice intervention strategies.

H_2: Negatively valenced strategies/tactics will be more successful in intervention attempts than positively valenced strategies/tactics.

RQ_2: What situational and individual difference factors affect intervention strategies/tactics in alcohol-related situations?

We answer these questions and test these hypotheses with findings from a survey of college students' alcohol-related attitudes, their drinking patterns, their decisions to intervention in two types of alcohol-related situations, and their influence attempts during interventions in these situations. The implications of these findings are discussed in terms of a transactional approach to interpersonal influence.

Method

Participants

Data were collected from 489 undergraduate students attending three different institutions: a large western university (n = 223), a large central midwestern university (n = 98), and a mid-sized upper midwestern university (n = 168). Participants in the study included 61% females and 39% males, with 85% of the respondents Caucasian, 9% Asian, 4% African-American, and 2% Hispanic. The majority were freshmen (52%); 18% were sophomores, 14% were juniors, and 16% were seniors. The median age of the group was 19 years, and the average GPA was 2.96. Twenty-six percent reported belonging to a social fraternity or sorority, and 39% indicated that they belonged to an average of two other campus organizations. For the most part, participants were either Catholic (35%) or Protestant (32%); 8% reported they were Jewish and 26% indicated that they associated either with a religious organization not listed (6%) or no religious organization at all (20%). The majority of respondents indicated that they attended religious services only occasionally (29%) or on special days (28%); 17% reported that they attended religious services regularly; 27% indicated that they did not attend at all.

Procedures

A five part questionnaire designed according to the principles advanced by Dillman (1978) was employed to address the research questions and test the research hypotheses. In the first section of the questionnaire, respondents were provided with five attitudinal statements related to drinking behavior. These statements included "drinking is never a good thing to do" to "a frequent drunk is okay if that is what the individual wants to do," with each subsequent statement suggesting a more permissive attitude towards drinking. The items are consistent with attitude measures used by other researchers (Hughes & Dodder, 1983; Johnson, 1988,

1989; Perkins & Berkowitz, 1986; Thorner, 1986). Participants were asked to indicate (a) the statement which best represented their own feelings about drinking alcoholic beverages and (b) the statement which best represented what they perceived to be the general campus attitude towards drinking alcoholic beverages.

In the second section of the questionnaire, respondents were asked a series of questions relating to their experiences intervening in drunk driving situations. In addition to questions concerning the general frequency with which these interventions occurred, respondents were asked to recall a specific situation in which they attempted to stop someone from driving and to (a) describe the situation in which the intervention occurred as well as the characteristics of the target involved (sex, age, class rank), (b) list their reasons for deciding to intervene in the situation, and (c) as closely as possible reconstruct in a conversational form the communication interaction that occurred. Respondents were also requested to discuss the outcome of the intervention attempt and the factors they felt contributed to either their success or failure. In addition, respondents were asked to recall a specific drunk driving situation in which they chose not to intervene, to identify specific characteristics of the target and their reasons for choosing not to get involved, and to discuss the factors which would had to have been present for them to intervene.

In the third section of the questionnaire, respondents were provided with a series of probes parallel to the ones in the drunk driving situation but related to their experiences with intervention into non-driving alcohol-abuse situations. Specifically, students were asked to recall a recent situation in which they attempted to talk with someone about a drinking problem and a situation in which they chose not to discuss a drinking problem with someone they knew was experiencing one. Again, respondents provided information about situation and target characteristics and identified the factors (reasons) which led to their decision to intervene or not to intervene. In addition, respondents were given a list of behavioral consequences typically experienced by someone who abuses alcohol (see Block & Ungerlieder, 1986; Heck, 1988; Rapaport, 1986) and were asked to indicate those consequences which contributed most to their perception that an alcohol abuse problem existed.

The fourth section of the questionnaire elicited information about the respondents' own drinking patterns. Specifically, they were asked to indicate at what age they began consuming alcoholic beverages, how often each week they consumed alcoholic beverages, the average number of drinks they consume at each sitting, their typical place to drink, and the number of times in the past year they had driven while intoxicated. Response categories for these measures (except for place to drink) were intentionally exaggerated (e.g., for number of drinks

at each sitting, the largest category provided was15 drinks/session) to make previously defined "excessive" categories (i.e. drinking five to six drinks per session) appear more "acceptable" (see Zickmund, 1991). These categories were later collapsed during analysis. Respondents also were provided with a series of problems associated with drinking and asked to indicate, on 5-point Likert-type scales, the degree to which each of these statements applied to them (for similar procedures see Heck, 1988; Hughes & Dodder, 1983; O'Connell & Patterson, 1988).

Finally, respondents provided demographic data. Measures in this section included gender, class rank, grade point average (GPA), age, race, and religion. In addition, respondents identified the different campus organizations to which they belonged and, as is frequently solicited in this research (Beck, 1983; Brennen et al., 1986a; Cherry, 1987; Schuh, Shipton, & Edman, 1986), the frequency with which they attended religious services.

In order to control for the effects of question order on survey responses, sections two and three of the questionnaire were counterbalanced. Also, to check the clarity of the questions, the questionnaire was pretested on a sample of students (n = 30). Results indicated that the questions were eliciting the desired response variations and that only minor alterations were needed in the wording of questions. Final questionnaires were sent to the three participating universities, completed by students during a single sitting (i.e. during class periods or during specially scheduled sessions), and then returned to the first author.

Upon return of the questionnaires, qualitative responses to the intervention situations were examined, and coding systems were developed for each. Each coding system was initially constructed through an examination of the literature on alcohol-related interventions (see Thomas & Seibold, 1993b, Seibold & Thomas, in press), and then inductively refined by the first author through examination of the data. Once the coding systems were developed, the first author coded each of the responses. In addition, a second coder not associated with the project coded 20% of the responses (see O'Keefe, 1988 for a discussion of these coding procedures). Agreement scores were computed to determine intercoder reliability.

The first coding system focused on intervention strategies. The questionnaire was designed to have students reconstruct intervention sequences as they transpired in conversational (i.e., turn-taking) form. Hence, each specific "turn" was coded as a single intervention attempt. A "turn" was defined as any message (or set of messages) employed by the agent prior to receiving a response from the target. Each intervention attempt was coded in a two-step fashion. First, employing the strategy typology developed by Thomas and Seibold (Seibold & Thomas, in press; Thomas & Seibold, 1993b), each attempt was coded into one of four strategy types: (a) Direct Positive Strategies (positively valenced verbal strategies delivered directly to the target in an

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

attempt to affect the behavior of the target and which identified the specific alcohol-related problem to be addressed); (b) Direct Negative Strategies (negatively valenced verbal strategies delivered directly to the target in an attempt to affect the behavior of the target and which identified the specific alcohol-related problem to be addressed); (c) Behavioral Strategies (positively or negatively valenced nonverbal strategies employed to affect the behavior of the target); and (d) Indirect Strategies (verbal strategies which attempted to affect the behavior of the target but which did not identify the specific alcohol-related problem to be addressed). Once the strategy type of each intervention attempt was determined, the specific influence tactic it reflected was identified (see Table 1). Agreement scores averaged 83% for strategy type (ranging from 78% to 98%) and 81% for message strategy (ranging from 73% to 100%).

Insert Table 1 about here

A second coding system was designed to deal with target responses. Target responses to each intervention were coded using a 5-item category system (see Table 2), ordered from most positive to least positive. These categories included (a) compliance (responses in which the target accepted assistance from the agent and/or complied with the agent's request); (b) delay (responses in which the target put off compliance until a later time or avoided responding directly to the agent); (c) denial (responses in which the target did not refuse complying with the agent but verbally or nonverbally indicated to the agent that he or she did not have a problem and, therefore, compliance was not necessary); (d) refusal (responses in which the target did not explicitly deny the existence of a problem but refused any assistance from the agent); and (e) hostility (responses in which the target became physically or verbally hostile (physically or verbally) with the agent). Agreement scores for this coding system averaged 89% (ranging from 87% to 97%).

Insert Table 2 about here

A category system was developed to code respondents' perceptions of the factors that contributed to either success (see Table 3) or failure (see Table 4) in their intervention attempt. Survey respondents had been asked to identify the specific factor which they felt contributed most to their success or failure. These factors were then coded as attributable to (1) the target, (2) the source, (3) the relationship between the target and the agent, (4) the message that was employed by the agent, or (5) the situation that existed. An average

agreement score of 88% (ranging from 100% to 85%) was obtained for this coding system.

Insert Tables 3 and 4 about here

Comparison of quantitative responses for strategy types and tactic types was conducted across several demographic categories. No significant differences in strategy use were found with respect to the university attended, class rank, membership in a social fraternity or sorority, race, religion, or the frequency with which respondents attended religious services. Hence, the ensuing analyses are based on the subsample of respondents from all three universities who reported intervening in a drunk driving situation (n = 359) and in a non-driving alcohol abuse situation (n = 113).

Results

Data relevant to students' attitudes toward drinking, their consumptions patterns, and their reasons for intervening in alcohol-related situations have been reported in a separate study (see Thomas & Seibold, 1993a for a complete description of these analyses). Those findings are summarized below to provide a context for the ensuing strategy analyses that are the focus of this study.

Reprise

Consistent with other studies on college student alcohol consumption (Block & Ungerlieder, 1986; Heck, 1988; Rapaport, 1986; Snodgrass & Wright, 1983), the majority of college students we sampled (90%) reported consuming alcoholic beverages one to two times per week, averaging four to six drinks per session. Heavier consumption patterns were characteristic of Caucasian, male seniors who belonged to social fraternities but lacked involvement in other campus organizations.

Although respondents did not feel alcohol was a problem in their lives, many students reported feeling guilty about their drinking (48%) and believed they needed to cut down (51%). Respondents also reported doing things when drinking that they later regretted (82%), foregoing other things in order to drink (38%), and feeling annoyed when others criticized them for their drinking (34%). Correlational analyses revealed that heavier consumption patterns were significantly associated with lower GPA and increased incidences of drunk driving.

In addition, analysis of attitudinal data revealed that the majority of students (69%) held permissive attitudes toward drinking, but perceived the general campus attitude toward drinking as significantly more permissive than their own. This was particularly true for

individuals who could be classified as only light or moderate drinkers. Heavy drinkers, however, tended to hold slightly more permissive attitudes toward drinking and, although they perceived the overall campus attitude as more permissive than their own, the difference between their own attitude toward drinking and the overall campus attitude was significantly less than those who drank only lightly or moderately.

Examination of the intervention decision data revealed that a significant proportion of students reported intervening into alcohol-related situations. This was particularly true of the drunk driving situation, where 73% of respondents (78% of the men and 70% of the women) indicated that they had attempted to prevent someone from driving drunk during the past term. Typically, these intervention occurred at a campus party (54%), but students significantly less often reported experiencing these situations at bars and restaurants (18%) and at their own place of residence (14%).

Consistent with previous findings (Heck, 1988; Rabow et al., 1986), targets of intervention were significantly more likely to be male for both men and women interveners. Analysis of agent-target gender pairings indicated that 37% of the men and 37% of the women reported intervening with a male target, while only 22% of the women and 5% of the men identified a women as their target--differences that were also beyond chance. For both men and women, these interventions were motivated primarily by their concern for the immediate physical harm that could come to targets if they were to drive (53%), concern for the physical safety of others (31%), friendship with the target (31%), and concern for their own safety (23%).

Several interesting features emerged with respect to the characteristics of those students who chose to intervene in the drunk driving situation. Though males and females were equally likely to intervene in the drunk driving situation, significant differences in decisions to intervene were obtained with respect to other demographic, consumption, and attitudinal variables. Demographic analyses revealed that Caucasian or Hispanic upperclassmen who belonged to fraternities or sororities, and who were either Catholic or not associated with any religion, were more likely to intervene than those respondents who did not possess these characteristics. Analysis of consumption behavior indicated that those individuals who consumed alcohol, who began consuming alcohol at a younger age, who consumed alcohol often and in great quantities, and who had experienced a variety of alcohol-related problems (including drunk driving) reported intervening in drunk driving situation more than those individuals without these habits. Finally, examination of attitudinal data suggested that students who reported intervening in drunk driving situations held more permissive attitudes toward

alcohol consumption. Although they perceived the general campus attitude to be significantly more permissive than their own attitudes, students who intervened viewed the general campus attitude as more consistent with their own than students who did not report intervening in a drunk driving situation.

In the non-driving alcohol abuse situation, 62% of the respondents indicated that they knew a peer whom they thought to be experiencing a chronic alcohol abuse problem. Respondents reported that they perceived these individuals to be experiencing a chronic abuse problem primarily because of their drinking patterns: drinking in great quantities (79%), drinking often (77%), and drinking to intoxication frequently (66%). Often target behaviors affected students' perceptions of an alcohol abuse problem. In particular, students' associated the behaviors of missing classes because of a hangover (49%) or drinking (45%), receiving a lower grade because of drinking (39%), driving while intoxicated (38%), drinking before driving (36%), and allowing drinking to interfere with class preparation (37%). Of those respondents who were aware of a peer with an alcohol abuse problem (n = 304), only 37% (32% of the men and 40% of the women) reported that they had attempted to intervene an average of two times during the past term.

Unlike the drunk driving situation, in which agents did not have the ability to choose the intervention context, those attempting to talk with a problem drinker typically chose either their friend's place of residence (46%) or their own place of residence (36%) as the intervention site. Although significantly less often, they also reported these interventions occurring at bars and restaurants (9%), while driving with the target (5%), at campus parties (2%), at out of town events (1%), and at hospitals after the target had been admitted for alcohol-related problems (1%). They reported selecting these contexts primarily because they wanted to talk with the individual in an environment which the target would view as safe and nonthreatening (38%) or because the timing of the intervention seemed appropriate (32%).

As with the drunk driving situation, targets of intervention were male significantly more often (66% vs 33% female), and either a first (31%) or fourth (25%) year student. Examination of gender pairings revealed that female agent-male target pairings (38%) were the significantly more common, followed by male agent-male target (28%), female agent-female target (27%), and male agent-female target (5%) pairings. Respondents indicated that decisions to intervene were motivated primarily by their friendship with the target (60%), their concern over how alcohol was affecting the target's personal life (41%), and the long term effects alcohol might have on the target (27%), differences that exceeded chance

expectations.

Present Study

Drunk Driving Situation. In light of the foregoing analyses, the data reported in this study concern students' strategy choices in alcohol-related intervention situations, the situational and individual difference factors which accounted for strategy selection, and the factors which contributed to intervention success. Consistent with other alcohol intervention studies and many compliance-gaining studies, we began our analyses by looking at combined overall strategy use in the drunk driving situation (see Table 5). Results relevant to RQ_1 indicated that students employed a variety of tactics that could be arrayed along a continuum between direct positive strategies and direct negative strategies. Consistent with H_1, respondents reported an overall preference for positively valenced intervention strategies with drunk drivers (χ^2 (3, n=806) = 187.57, $p < .001$). In particular, respondents indicated an overall preference for using complex requests (23%), simple commands (15%), simple requests (14%), and complex requests (12%), χ^2 (14, n=806) = 773.66, $p < .001$. However, these were not the most successful strategies in this intervention situation. Consistent with H_2, negatively valenced strategies, although used less frequently, enjoyed a higher percentage of reported success (χ^2 (3, n=273) = 12.49, $p < .01$). Those strategies that were most successful were (a) using another to intervene (100% success), verbally threatening the target (successful 75% of the time), redirecting the target to an alternative behavior (successful 67% of the time), and preventing the target from driving--usually by taking the keys (successful 63% of the time), χ^2 (13, n=273) = 201.51, $p < .001$. Interestingly, in contrast to previous studies in the alcohol intervention area and in the compliance-gaining area, when all strategies used in drunk driving interventions are combined, no significant differences were found with respect to the situation, gender of agent, or agent -target gender pairings (RQ_2).

Insert Table 5 about here

In order to more fully understand the alcohol intervention process, we next examined strategy use across successive intervention attempts in the drunk driving situation. Consistent with H_1, analysis of strategy types revealed that respondents reported employing direct positive strategies in initial intervention attempts more than any other strategy type (χ^2 (4,

n=359) = 196.29, $p < .001$). Fifty-two percent of all strategies used in initial attempts were direct positive strategies (see Table 6). Direct negative strategies accounted for only 33% of the strategies used, and indirect (9%) and behavioral strategies (6%) were rarely employed. This was particularly true for women, who reported using direct positive strategies significantly more than did men (58% vs 43%, respectively). In contrast, although direct positive strategies were still preferred most by men (43%), a significant portion of men (40%), as opposed to women (28%), reported using direct negative strategies in initial intervention attempts (χ^2 (3, n = 351) = 9.14, $p < .01$).

Insert Table 6 about here

Significant differences in strategy type use across agent-target gender pairings further illuminated these trends (χ^2 (9, n = 351) = 16.93, $p < .05$). Direct positive strategies were especially characteristic of female agent-male target (60%) and female agent-female target (54%) pairings (see Table 7); direct positive strategies accounted for only 50% of the strategies reported in male agent-female target gender pairings and for only 42% of the strategies reported in male agent-male target gender pairings. However, direct negative strategies were most characteristic of male agent-male target gender pairings (42%); direct negative strategies accounted for only 27% of the strategies used in female agent-male target pairings, 27% in female agent-male target pairings, and 25% in male agent-female target pairings. Interestingly, although indirect and behavioral strategies were not employed very often as initial strategies, indirect strategies were employed most in the male agent-male target situation (12%) and behavioral strategies were employed most in the female agent-male target situation (19%). Women prefer to utilize the less assertive direct positive strategies in initial intervention attempts irrespective of the gender of the target, whereas men tend to utilize these strategies more with female targets than with male targets.

Insert Table 7 about here

Germane to RQ_1, examination of specific influence tactics in drunk driving intervention (see Table 6) also revealed that the direct positive tactics of simple request (23%) and complex request (27%), and the direct negative tactics of simple command (17%) and complex command (14%) were the most likely messages to be employed by students (χ^2 (13, n =

351) = 544.00, $p < .001$). This was true for men and women, and across agent-target gender pairings. Although not significant, analysis relevant to RQ_2 indicated that there was a slight tendency for (a) women to use complex requests slightly more than men (31% vs 20%), especially when the target was male (35%), (b) males to use simple commands more than females (22% vs 15%), especially when the target was female (25%), and (c) males to use complex commands more than females (15% vs 13%), especially when the target was male (17%).

Initial intervention attempts in the drunk driving situation enjoyed only a 17% success rate (see Table 8). Most targets responded to these attempts by denying that they were too drunk to drive (62%) or by simply refusing to comply with the agent's request (19%), χ^2 (5, n = 303) = 384.97, $p < .001$. These response patterns were similar for males and females and across gender pairings, but trends in the data suggested that women received more denial responses than men (66% vs 57%) and targets complied more with men than they did with women (22% vs 14%). Consistent with H_2 (see Table 9), the most successful strategies in initial attempts were the behavioral tactics of verbal threat (100%) and the indirect tactic of asking a friend to intervene (100%).

Insert Tables 8 & 9 about here

In second intervention attempts (n = 285), consistent with H_1, direct positive strategies again were reported as the most used strategy type (see Table 6), χ^2 (3, n = 285) = 30.07, $p < .001$. Even in light of resistance, 34% of the respondents maintained a positive approach to the target. However, the use percentage of this strategy type decreased on this turn (34% vs 52% initially), suggesting weaker support for H_1 (positively valenced strategies) in second attempts. Furthermore, strategies reported for this turn reflected a marked increase in the use of behavioral strategies (15% vs 6% initially) and indirect strategies (19% vs 9%), while use of direct negative strategies remained about the same (32% vs 33%). This was true for both men and women across all agent-target gender pairings. In particular, respondents reported greater use of complex requests (24%), complex commands (12%), preventative techniques (14%) such as taking the target's keys, and redirection techniques (14%), χ^2 (11, n = 285) = 166.92, $p < .001$. This suggests a strategic shift in agents' approaches to more assertive and/or creative intervention tactics during second intervention attempts.

These second intervention attempts were more successful than were initial attempts.

According to influencers, 48% of the targets complied with agents' second attempt, whereas only 17% complied in initial attempts (see Table 8). Targets who did not comply with agents on this turn continued to deny that they were drunk (23%) or simply refused to comply with the target (24%), X^2 (4, n = 245) = 191.84, $p < .001$. These responses were similar for both men and women across agent-target gender pairings. In this attempt, the strongest success was still experienced with physically preventing the target from driving (86%), but the strategies of verbally threatening the target (80%), using authority to gain compliance (75%), and employing negative altercasting strategies (68%) were also successful (see Table 9). This is further support for H_2, which predicted that negatively valenced strategies would be most successful intervention strategies.

Those agents who continued to persist in their intervention attempt (n = 133) reported greater use of direct negative strategies (57%) than direct positive strategies (25%) on their third attempt to intervene (X^2 (3, n = 133) = 27.81, $p < .001$). These results are not consistent with H_1. By the time agents had reached third turn intervention attempts, they reported greater preference for negatively valenced strategies over positively valenced strategies. In particular, both men and women across all gender pairings reported using simple commands (26%), redirection techniques (24%), and complex requests (21%), X^2 (12, n = 133) = 77.64, $p < .001$ (see Table 6). The majority (66%) of intervention attempts on this turn were successful (X^2 (4, n = 115) = 164.96, $p < .001$), although 10% of the targets still denied they were too drunk to drive and 20% refused to comply (see Table 8).

Final intervention attempts (see Table 6) reported by respondents (n = 37) were mostly behavioral in nature (X^2 (3, n = 37) = 9.38, $p < .05$); 43% of respondents reported using some preventative measure during this turn, such as taking the target's keys (35%) or physically restraining the target (8%). Only 22% of the respondents reported using direct positive strategies on this turn, 27% reported using direct negative strategies, and 8% reported using indirect strategies. For the most part, these behavioral strategies were successful (X^2 (3, n = 33) = 45.67, $p < .001$); 76% of the targets who received a fourth intervention attempt complied with the target (see Table 8), particularly with respect to physical threats and physical prevention, and such indirect strategies as stalling and following the driver home (see Table 9). However, even after four influence attempts by the agent, two target students (6%) still denied that they were too drunk to drive, four target students (12%) continued to refuse the agent's help, and two target students (6%) became openly hostile.

Overall, those agents who were successful attributed their success to the message that they constructed (X^2 (4, n = 282) = 208.00, p < .001). Fifty-three percent of the respondents who were successful in preventing the target from driving while intoxicated cited message factors such as their tone of voice, their use of forceful communication, or their ability to take the keys away from the target as primary reasons for their success. Agents felt that characteristics of the target (16%), their relationship with the target (15%), elements of the situation (12%), and personal characteristics (4%) were less important in their success. Although message factors were the most frequently cited reasons for success by both men and women, men tended to attribute their success to message factors more than women (63% vs 46%), whereas women saw their relationship with the target (19% vs 10%) or factors associated with the situation (16% vs 7%) as contributing to their success more than men (X^2 (4, n = 282) = 11.55, p < .05).

In contrast, those students who were unsuccessful attributed their failure to the characteristics of the target (65%) as opposed to the situation (20%) or the message (15%). This was particularly true for women (X^2 (2, n = 40) = 6.88, p < .05). Seventy-nine percent of the women who failed in their intervention attempts attributed their failure to target characteristics, such as stubbornness, their arrogance, or their meanness, whereas only 44% of the men who failed identified target characteristics as responsible. Men also tended to attribute failure to message characteristics (31%), such as a lack of forceful communication, and to elements of the situation (25%).

Alcohol Abuse Situation. Strategy use in the chronic alcohol abuse situation differed demonstrably from influence attempts in the drunk driving situation. As with the drunk driving situation, we began our analysis of message strategies by examining overall strategy use across all intervention attempts. Relevant to RQ_1, influencers in the non-driving alcohol abuse situation employed a variety of different message strategies (see Table 10). Consistent with H_1, they preferred positively valenced strategies over negatively valenced strategies (X^2 (2, n = 165) = 143.06, p < .001). Specifically, interveners in this situation exhibited greater use of the the direct positive tactics (69%) of complex requests (47%) and persuasion (13%) to affect intervention, and, to a lessor extent, the direct negative tactics (19%) of complex commands (11%) and negative altercasting (5%), X^2 (11, n = 165) = 365.80, p < .001. In this situation, use of indirect strategies was fairly limited (11%), and agents did not report the use of any behavioral strategies. Also, consistent with H_2, negative strategies

enjoyed greater success, as is reflected by the percentage of each strategy type that was successful (33% for direct positive strategies and 36% for direct negative strategies (X^2 (2, n = 43) = 15.96, p < .001. In general, these results suggest that intervention agents maintained a more positive tone than those in the drunk driving situation and engaged the target in more discussion of specific reasons for compliance, as reflected in the strategies of complex requests and persuasion. Interestingly, contrary to results from previous compliance-gaining studies, analyses relevant to **RQ2** found no significant differences in overall strategy use (i.e. for the four general categories of strategies used) with respect to gender of the agent, agent -target gender pairings, or situation; both men and women intervening with male and female targets employed similar intervention strategies across all interaction contexts.

Insert Table 10 about here

Next, we examined strategy use across successive intervention attempts (see Table 11). Consistent with H_1, analysis of strategy types employed in initial intervention attempts in the alcohol abuse situation identified direct positive strategies as the most frequently reported type of strategy used (X^2 (2, n = 96) = 52.94, p < .001); 68% of all strategies reported in initial attempts were direct positive. Direct negative strategies accounted for only 22% of the strategies employed, and indirect strategies accounted for only 10% (behavioral strategies were not reported as being used in this situation). No differences in strategy use appeared across contexts; however, in contrast to analysis of overall strategy use, specific gender differences in strategy type use emerged in these initial attempts. Specifically, results indicated that men employed direct positive strategies more than women (83% vs 61%), women employed direct negative strategies more than men (24% vs 17%), especially when the target was male, and women employed indirect strategies exclusively (15% vs 0%), especially with female targets (X^2 (2, n = 96) = 6.66, p < .05). Hence, with respect to **RQ2**, specific gender differences in strategy type usage existed within initial intervention attempts.

Insert Table 11 about here

Within initial attempts, specific influence tactics were preferred. Complex requests (46%) were used most frequently, followed by persuasion tactics (14%) and complex commands (14%), X^2 (10, n = 96) = 180.38, p < .001. These preferences were consistent

across gender and agent-target gender pairings, although men had a tendency to initiate discussion of the problem with the target through simple or complex requests more than women (13% vs 6%, 57% vs 41%, respectively), and women exclusively reported that they engaged in a discussion of the problem with the target only after the target asked about a possible alcohol problem .

Most initial intervention attempts for both men and women failed in their ability to gain compliance from the target (X^2 (4, n = 75) = 53.87, p < .001); only 33% of the respondents (31% of the males and 35% of the females) reported a positive response from the target (see Table 12). Most targets responded by denying that they had a problem (47%). This was true for all strategy types, although direct negative strategies enjoyed a slightly higher success rate than direct positive strategies (45% vs 29%), providing support for H_2 in initial intervention attempts in the alcohol abuse situation (see Table 13).

Insert Tables 12 & 13 about here

Second intervention attempts were reported by 47% (n = 54) of the initial intervening respondents. Analysis of strategy types provided support for H_1, in that direct positive strategies (72%) again were reported more frequently than either direct negative strategies (15%) or indirect strategies (13%), X^2 (2, n = 54) = 36.78, p < .001 (see Table 11). This was especially true for female agent-female target gender pairings in which 90% of the strategies employed were direct positive (direct positive strategies accounted for only about 60% of the strategies reported in other gender pairings), X^2 (6, n = 54) = 14.23, p < .05. Interestingly, males reported using direct negative strategies most with female targets (40%) and indirect strategies with male targets (36%).

Examination of specific influence tactics used in second intervention attempts revealed an even stronger use of complex requests (56%) than in first intervention attempts, with less frequent use of redirection techniques (13%), and persuasion techniques (9%), X^2 (8, n = 54) = 113.68, p < .001. In contrast to the drunk driving situation, this move away from discussion or negotiation tactics and towards more of an asking approach suggests a "softening" or "other-oriented" approach of the agent in trying to gain compliance. Analysis of gender pairings revealed that message strategy use differed with respect to the gender of the influencer and the gender of the target (X^2 (24, n = 54) = 36.79, p < .05). Complex requests were uniquely characteristic of women, especially when intervening with a female target (75% vs

56% with a male target--men reported using these strategies only 36% of the time with male targets and only 20% of the time with female targets). On the other hand, men reported using redirection techniques, especially with male targets (36& vs 17% for women), and using simple requests for both male and female targets (18% and 20%, respectively).

Second intervention attempts were successful only 30% of the time (X^2 (4, n = 52) = 22.81, $p < .001$ (see Table 12). Targets of intervention on this attempt either continued to deny that a problem existed (31%) or refused any help from the agent (31%). These response patterns were similar for both male and female interveners with respect to male and female targets, although female agents enjoyed a slightly higher success rate than male agents (35% vs 31%). Although not used frequently (see Table 13), the tactics that were most successful in this attempt included persuasion (59%), use of authority (100%), negative altercasting (50%), and redirection (57%).

Only eleven individuals (2 males and 9 females) reported a third intervention attempt (see Table 11). Analysis of strategy types suggested that on this attempt, an equal likelihood of direct positive and direct negative strategy use existed for both men and women across all gender pairings; use of direct positive strategies decreased to 55% (from 72% on the second attempt), and use of direct negative strategies increased to 36% (from 15% on the second attempt). As in the drunk driving situation, this provides some evidence that preference for direct positive strategies (H_1) may not persist across all intervention attempts. In terms of specific influence tactics (RQ_1), these eleven individuals reported using the direct positive tactics of complex requests (27%) and persuasion (27%), but also reported using complex commands (27%) and appeals to authority (9%). In these third attempts, only two individuals (22%) accepted help from the agent (see Table 12). One individual put off the target by delaying compliance, and the other six individuals refused any help from the agent. Interestingly, the strategy with the greatest percentage of success on this attempt was the complex request strategy (50%)(see Table 13).

Only four respondents indicated a fourth attempt in the alcohol abuse situation (see Table 11). These individuals exclusively employed direct positive strategies (three used simple requests and one used a complex request). None of these agents were successful in influencing the target, and the target continued to deny that he or she had a problem.

Summary and Implications

This study examined the interpersonal influence strategies employed by college students' in two alcohol-related situations and empirically tested hypotheses relevant to their use. Through

survey methods, this study identified and classified the intervention strategies employed by college students (RQ_1), and found that (a) students use a variety of influence tactics when attempting to intervene in alcohol-related situations; (b) these influence strategies vary in their degree of assertiveness and/or intrusiveness; and, most importantly, (c) students' employ multiple influence attempts in order to achieve their goal. Also, support for the hypotheses that positively valenced strategies are preferred over negatively valenced strategies (H_1), but only in early intervention attempts, and that negatively valenced strategies are more successful in gaining compliance of influence targets than positively valenced strategies (H_2), was obtained. Finally, examination of situational and individual difference factors affecting strategy usage revealed that gender (both the gender of the influence agent and the influence target) significantly impacted strategy usage, especially in initial intervention attempts, and that the goal of the influence agent rather than the situation in which the intervention occurred contributed more to influencers' use of strategies across intervention attempts.

The present findings serve to highlight significant pragmatic issues for both communication researchers and alcohol practitioners. First, our findings indicate that college students are faced with decisions to intervene in alcohol-related situations quite frequently and that, in many instances, they choose to help their drinking peers. This is particularly true with respect to drunk driving situations, where 73% of our respondents indicated that they had attempted to stop one of their friends from driving while intoxicated. Somewhat disconcerting, however, is the frequency of intervention associated with chronic abuse problems. The present data revealed that 62% of the respondents sampled were aware of someone whom they felt was experiencing an alcohol-abuse problem, but only 37% of these individuals attempted to intervene. In one respect, this is not too surprising. Studies of alcohol abuse in the college environment suggest that these chronic problems are only in the early stages of development (Denzin, 1987). Thus, agents' confidence in their beliefs about the target's problem and the evidence undergirding these beliefs may not be as strong as their belief or evidence that someone is too drunk to drive. However, evidence from the present study suggests that those individuals who did choose to involve themselves in the alcohol abuse situation (as opposed to the drunk driving situation) employed fewer strategies, used strategies that tended to be less assertive in nature, and were less successful in their intervention attempts. Thus, it may be that students perceive intervention in an alcohol abuse situation as a much more difficult and potentially stigmatizing task, and are consequently less willing to pursue their goal in the face

of resistance. Future studies should explore these implications.

Second, our analysis of the intervention scenario underscores the importance of persistence in the influence process and agents' need for varied strategic repertoires. In both the drunk driving situation and the alcohol abuse situation, agents were consistently met with negative responses to their initial attempt. Greater success was achieved by those individuals who pursued their objective through the use of additional (and more negatively valenced) influence strategies. In fact, those agents who were successful attributed their success mostly to message factors, particularly the more negatively valenced strategies; it was their communication abilities which allowed them to overcome the objections of a highly resistant target. In contrast, those individuals who were not successful identified target factors (i.e., their stubbornness) as contributing most to their failure. This might be indicative of agents' lack of ability or unwillingness to employ assertive strategies to overcome the resistance of the target. From a communication perspective, these findings suggest that increased assertiveness training might be warranted, especially with negatively valenced strategies.

In addition, the present findings offer insight into several significant theoretical issues relevant to the interpersonal influence process. First, the failure to obtain variations in strategy use for situational and most individual difference factors suggests that, in terms of alcohol intervention practices, college students (and other influence agents) operate from a singular strategic "frame" when attempting to accomplish influence outcomes. Results of this study indicate that college students employ relatively similar strategies to accomplish common instrumental goals despite the fact that they are motivated by different reasons, and that these strategies are consistently employed over different contexts. Specifically, most college students indicated a preference for either requests or commands (differentiated by the degree to which justifications for compliance were included) when attempting to intervene in both alcohol-related situations used in this study. This suggests that a common communication repertoire might exist with respect to the influence process, and place in question findings concerning variations in strategy use derived from hypothetically induced situations, typical of many compliance-gaining studies.

This conclusion is given greater support through our examination of sequential strategy use. As indicated above, variation in strategy use was obtained only in terms of gender, and these variations were typically characteristics of only initial intervention attempts. In subsequent intervention attempts, where influence agents moved to greater use of more assertive strategies, these differences in terms of gender disappeared.

Finally, the results of this study have significant theoretical implications with respect to

studying interpersonal influence processes. To begin with, the study highlights the importance of studying interpersonal influence from a transactional perspective. Historically, interpersonal influence analyses have focused primarily on the strategies and tactics used by interactants to accomplish their instrumental goals, along with identifying the potential array of situational and individual difference factors affecting strategy choice. Recent criticisms of this approach, however, have argued that these analyses succumb to a source-oriented bias (Seibold et al., in press) and reflect a "noninteractive and linear approach to and rendering of compliance-gaining" (Garko, 1990, p. 152). Contrary to this traditional source-oriented linear perspective (see Monroe et al., 1990, Seibold & Thomas 1993a), our findings reveal that conjoint influences operate from the moment the influence agent becomes aware of his/her goal, and continue throughout the influence episode. This was particularly evident in the analysis of sequential strategy use. As predicted, influence agents preferred the more positively valenced, less assertive strategies in initial intervention attempts. However, in the face of resistance, influencers moved to alternative approaches which, in their estimation, would be more successful in affecting intervention. Typically, these moves were toward more direct negative strategies, such as forcibly taking the keys from the target or threatening the target. In other cases, however, subsequent moves were towards more indirect strategies, such as engaging in stall techniques or redirecting the target toward a different course of action. These trends clearly suggest that agents consider both situational and target factors in selecting subsequent strategies.

In addition, this study emphasizes the significance of considering multiple communication objectives in the study of intervention processes (see Clark & Delia, 1979; Newton & Burgoon, 1990; Dillard, 1990a, 1990b; Wilson & Putnam, 1990). The results reported in this study suggest that not only are these multiple communication objectives relevant to the influence process, they are also differentially weighted in the interaction situation. For example, in both intervention situations, respondents reported preference for positively valenced strategies in initial attempts. In essence, this reflects a concern not only for the agent's instrumental objective, but also for interpersonal objectives (wanting to maintain a positive relationship with the target) and identity-management objectives (not wanting to embarrass the target or to appear as as an "inconsiderate" individual). However, analysis of subsequent strategy use suggests that agents "reweigh" these objectives, depending upon the outcome they want to achieve. In the drunk driving situation, for example, strategic moves were towards increasingly more assertive and intrusive strategies. In terms of communication objectives, this suggests that agents placed greater weight on their instrumental objectives (stopping the

target from driving while intoxicated) and decreased the importance of accomplishing interpersonal objectives (not caring if the target got angry) and/or identity-management objectives (not caring if the target "looked bad" by having to be forcibly restrained). Though similar results were obtained in the alcohol abuse situation, strategy use in subsequent intervention attempts suggested that agents maintained a balance between these objectives more so than in the drunk driving situation. Movement toward negatively valenced strategies was more restrained here, and the most intrusive strategies (behavioral) were not employed. Hence, in this situation, the data seem to suggest that agents were concerned with instrumental objectives (as evidenced by use of persuasion and complex request strategies), but interpersonal objectives (staying friends with the target) and identity management objectives (not stigmatizing the target) maintained a high priority throughout the interaction episode.

Finally, our study lends insight into the overt influence process. Kellermann and her colleagues (Kellermann, in press; Kellermann & Cole, in press; Kellermann & Kim, 1992), in their research on "metagoals," argue that strategy choices are related to their perceived social "appropriateness" and to their "efficiency." The data presented here suggests that both principles operate in the alcohol-intervention situation, and are contingent upon the target's response coupled with the agent's desire for compliance. For example, agents' selection of positively valenced strategies in initial intervention attempts points to the dominance of the "social appropriateness" norm in strategy selection. In contrast, those agents who persisted in their influence attempts (especially in the drunk driving situation) many times chose strategies which could be considered "socially inappropriate" yet strategically "efficient" (physically preventing the target from driving) in order to accomplish their instrumental goal. It may be that noncompliance with "socially appropriate" strategies inherently creates a more crisis-oriented situation, which, in turn, defines the more "efficient" yet "socially inappropriate" strategies as socially appropriate. This interpretation might help explain the less frequent use of negatively valenced strategies in the alcohol abuse situation. In that noncompliance does not place the target in immediate danger as it does with the drunk driving situation, the more efficient strategies may remain defined as socially inappropriate, and thus their use is inhibited.

References

Baer, J. S., Stacy, A., & Larimer, M. (1991). Biases in the perception of drinking norms among college students. Journal of Studies on Alcohol, 52, 580-586.

Beck, K. H. (1983). Psychosocial patterns of alcohol abuse in a college population. Journal of Alcohol and Drug Education, 28, 64-72.

Beck, K. H., & Summons, T. G. (1985). A comparison of the social context for alcohol consumption of college students and convicted DWI offenders. Journal of Alcohol and Drug Education, 30, 31-39.

Berkowitz, A. D., & Perkins, H. W. (1986). Problem drinking among college students: A review of recent research. Journal of American College Health, 35, 21-28.

Block, S. A., & Ungerlieder, S. (1986). The university chemical dependency project: Final report. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 286 103).

Bolton-Brownlee, A. (1987). Alcohol use among college students. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 291 014).

Brennen, A. F., Walfish, S., & AuBuchon, P. (1986a). Alcohol use and abuse in college students. I: A review of individual and personality correlates. International Journal of the Addictions, 21, 449-474.

Brennen, A. F., Walfish, S., & AuBuchon, P. (1986b). Alcohol use and abuse in college students. II: Social/environmental correlates, methodological issues, and implications for intervention. International Journal of the Addictions, 21, 475-493.

Burnham, R. B., & Nelson, S. J. (1984, October). When "alternatives" aren't. Association of College Unions-International Bulletin, 52 (5), 15-17.

Cantrill, J. G., & Seibold, D. R. (1986). The perceptual contrast explanation of sequential request strategy effectiveness. Human Communication Research, 13, 253-267.

Cherry, A. (1987). Undergraduate alcohol misuse: Suggested strategies for prevention and early detection. Journal of Alcohol and Drug Education, 32, 1-6.

Clark, R. A., & Delia, J. G. (1979). Topoi and rhetorical competence. Quarterly Journal of Speech, 65, 187-206.

Craig, R. T. (1986). Goals in discourse. In D. G. Ellis & W. A. Donohue (Eds.). Contemporary issues in language discourse processes (pp. 257-273). Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.

Dean, J. C., & Bryon, W. A. (1982). Alcohol programs for higher education. Carbondale, IL: Southern Illinois University Press.

Denzin, N. K. (1987). The alcoholic self. Newbury Park, CA: Sage.

Dillard, J. P. (1990a). The nature and substance of goals in tactical communication. In M. J. Cody & M. L. McLaughlin (Eds.), The psychology of tactical communication (pp. 70-90). London: Multilingual Matters.

Dillard, J. P. (1990b). A goal-driven model of interpersonal influence. In J. P. Dillard (Ed.), Seeking compliance: The production of interpersonal influence messages (pp. 41-56). Scottsdale, AZ: Gorsuch Scarisbrick.

Dillard, J. P., & Burgoon, M. (1985). Situational influences on the selection of compliance-gaining messages: Two test of the predictive utility of the Cody-McLaughlin typology, Communication Monographs, 52, 289-304.

Dillman, D. A. (1978). Mail and telephone surveys: The 'total design method'. New York: John Wiley & Sons.

Donovan, J. E., Jessor, R., & Jessor, L. (1983). Problem drinking in adolescence and young adulthood: A follow-up study. Journal of Studies on Alcohol, 44, 189-137.

Fillmore, K. (1975). Relationships between specific drinking problems in early adulthood and middle age: An exploratory 20-year follow up. Journal of Studies on Alcohol, 36, 882-907.

Gadaleto, A. F., & Anderson, D. S. (1986). Continued progress: The 1979, 1982, and 1985 college alcohol surveys. Journal of College Student Personnel, 27, 499-509.

Garko, M. G. (1990). Perspectives on and conceptualizations of compliance-gaining. Communication Quarterly, 38, 138-157.

Globetti, G., Haworth-Hoeppner, S., & Marasco, F. (1988). Problem drinking at a southern university. NASPA Journal, 25, 153-168.

Heck, E. J. (1988). Alcohol use survey of University of Kansas students. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 301 834).

Hernandez, A. C., & Rabow, J. (1987). Passive and assertive interventions in public and private drunken driving situations. Journal of Students on Alcohol, 48, 269-271.

Hickenbottom, J. P., Bissonnette, R. P., & O'Shea, R. M. (1987). Preventative medicine and college alcohol abuse. Journal of American College Health, 36, 67-72.

Hirschorn, M. W. (1987, March 25). Alcohol seen as number one campus abuse problem, despite concerns about students' drug use. Chronicle of Higher Education, 33, 32, 34.

Hughes, S. P., & Dodder, R. A. (1983). Alcohol consumption patterns among college populations: Journal of College Student Personnel, 24, 257-264.

Hunter, J. E., & Boster, F. J. (1987). A model of compliance-gaining message selection. Communication Monographs, 54, 63-84.

Johnson, P. B. (1988). Drinking-related beliefs of male college students. Journal of Alcohol and Drug Education, 34, 17-22.

Johnson, P. B. (1989). Personality correlates of heavy and light drinking female college students. Journal of Alcohol and Drug Education, 34, 17-22.

Jung, J. (1986). How significant others cope with problem drinkers. International Journal of the Addictions, 21, 5-22.

Kellermann, K. (in press). Understanding tactical choice: Metagoals in conversation. Human Communication Research.

Kellermann, K., & Cole, T. (in press). Classifying compliance-gaining messages: Do you know what taxonomies your strategies are in? Communication Theory.

Kellermann, K., & Kim, M-S. (1992, May). Working within constraints: Tactical choices in the pursuit of social goals. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the International Communication Association, Miami, FL.

Lightsey, M. L., & Sweeney, M. E. (1985). Life problems experienced from drinking: Level of problem drinking among youthful DWI offenders. Journal of Alcohol and Drug Education, 30, 65-82.

Lim, T-S. (1990). The influence of receiver's resistance on persuaders' verbal aggressiveness. Communication Quarterly, 38, 170-188.

Macaulay, J. R., & Berkowitz, L. (1970). Altruism and helping behavior. New York: Academic Press.

Magner, D. K. (1989, July 5). College "teams" trade information and experiences in an effort to curb campus drug and alcohol abuse. Chronicle of Higher Education, 35, 25-26.

Marwell, G., & Schmitt, D. R. (1967). Dimensions of compliance-gaining behavior: An empirical analysis. Sociometry, 30,350-364.

Miller, G. R., Boster, F. J., Roloff, M. E., & Seibold, D. R. (1987). MBRS rekindled: Some thoughts on compliance gaining in interpersonal settings. In M. E. Roloff & G. R. Miller (Eds.), Interpersonal processes: New directions in communication research (pp. 89-116). Newbury Park, CA: Sage.

Miller, G. R., & Burgoon, M. (1978). Persuasion research: Review and commentary. In B. D. Rubin (Ed.), Communication yearbook 2 (pp. 29-47). New Brunswick, NJ: Transaction Books.

Monroe, C., DiSalvo, V. S., Lewis, J. J., & Borzi, M. G. (1990). Conflict behaviors of difficult subordinates: Interactive effects of gender. Southern Communication Journal, 56, 12-23.

Monto, M. A., Newcomb, M. D., Rabow, J., & Hernandez, A. C. R. (1992). Social status and drunk-driving intervention. Journal of Studies on Alcohol, 53, 63-68.

Ness, E. (1985). The identification, confrontation and referral of problem drinkers by resident assistants. Journal of Alcohol and Drug Education, 31, 32-40.

Newton, D. A., & Burgoon, J. K. (1990). The use and consequences of verbal influence strategies during interpersonal disagreements. Human Communication Research, 16, 477-518.

Nichols, J. L., Weinstein, E. G., Ellingstad, V. S., & Struckman-Johnson, D. L. (1978). The specific deterrent effect of ASAP education and rehabilitation programs. Journal of Safety Research, 10, 177-187.

O'Connell, D. F., & Patterson, H. O. (1988). A survey of current college alcohol abuse programs, attitudes and training needs. Journal of Alcohol and Drug Education, 34, 61-69.

O'Keefe, B. J. (1988, March). Message design logic and the management of multiple goals. Paper presented to the9th Annual Conference on Discourse Analysis, Temple University, Philadelphia.

Perkins, H. W., & Berkowitz, A. D. (1986). Perceiving the community norms of alcohol use among college students: Some research implications for campus alcohol education programming. International Journal of the Addictions, 21, 961-976.

Rabow, J., Hernandez, A. C. R., & Watts, R. K. (1986). College students do intervene in drunk driving situations. Sociology and Social Research, 70, 224-225.

Rabow, J., Newcomb, M. D., Monto, M. A., & Hernandez, A. C. R. (1990). Altruism in drunk driving situations: Personal and situational factors in intervention. Social Psychology Quarterly, 53, 199-213.

Rapaport, R. J. (1986). An examination of alcohol and other drug usage by Central Michigan University undergraduate students. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 293 044).

Rapaport, R. J., Cooper, A., & Leemaster, H. (1984). Student alcohol misuse: The negative effects of drinking in college. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 252 781)

Rapaport, R. J., & Look, S. (1987). Evaluation of the alcohol education discipline program (AEDP) for the 1986-87 academic year. Alcohol abuse intervention and prevention program. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 293 045)

Schuh, J. H., Shipton, W. C., & Edman, N. (1986). Counseling problems encountered by resident assistants: An update. Journal of College Student Personnel, 27, 26-33.

Seay, T. A., & Beck, T. D. (1984). Alcoholism among college students. Journal of College Student Personnel, 25, 90-92.

Seibold, D. R., Cantrill, J. G., & Meyers, R. A. (in press). Communication and interpersonal influence. In M. L. Knapp & G. R. Miller (Eds.), Handbook of interpersonal communication (2nd Ed.). Newbury Park, CA: Sage.

Seibold, D. R., & Thomas, R. W. (in press). Rethinking the role of interpersonal influence processes in alcohol intervention situations. Journal of Applied Communication Research.

Snodgrass, G., & Wright, L. S. (1983). Alcohol and polydrug use among college undergraduates. NASPA Journal, 21, 26-35.

Thomas, R. W., & Seibold, D. R. (1993a, November). College students' attitudes toward alcohol, alcohol consumption patterns, and decisions to intervene in alcohol-related situations. Paper presented to the Commission on Health Communication at the Speech Communication Association Convention. Miami, FL.

Thomas, R. W., & Seibold, D. R. (1993b). Interpersonal influence processes in the 'home treatment method' of alcoholism intervention. Journal of Alcohol and Drug Education, 38, 49-79.

Thorner, G. (1986). A review of the literature on alcohol abuse and college students, and the alcohol awareness program at SUNYAB. Journal of Alcohol and Drug Education , 31, 41-53.

Wilson, S. R., & Putnam, L. L. (1990). Interaction goals in negotiation. In J. A. Anderson (Ed.), Communication yearbook 13 (pp. 374-406). Newbury Park, CA: Sage.

Wiseman, J. P. (1983). The 'home treatment': The first steps in trying to cope with an alcoholic husband. In D. H. Olson & B. C. Miller (Eds.), Family studies review yearbook: Vol. 6 (pp. 352-360). Beverly Hills, CA: Sage.

Zickmund, W. G. (1991). Business research methods. Fort Worth, TX: Dryden.

Table 1

Intervention Strategies Employed in Alcohol-Related Situations

Strategy Type/ Tactic Type	Definition/Example
Direct Positive	**Positively valenced verbal strategies delivered directly to the target in an attempt to affect the behavior of the target, and which identify the specific alcohol-related problem to be addressed**
Request-Simple	Agent asks target to alter his or her behavior in some way but provides no reason or justification for intervention *Ex: Why don't you let me drive? Please, let me drive? Please, stop drinking.*
Request-Complex	Agent asks target to alter his or her behavior in some way and provides a reason or justification for intervention *Ex: Are you sure you're okay? I'd like to help you if I can. You are wasted, why don't you let me drive? Please, let me drive? I'm concerned about you.*
Persuasion	Agent talks to target about the problem and suggests that an alternative course of action would be more appropriate--integrates concerns and counter arguments of the target *Ex: Listen, I know you think you are alright, but you've had quite a bit to drink tonight. Why don't you...* *I know you don't like anyone driving your car, but...* *I realize you have been under a lot of pressure lately, but I think you have a serious problem...*

Table 1 (cont.)

Intervention Strategies Employed in Alcohol-Related Situations

Strategy Type/ Tactic Type	**Definition/Example**
Direct Negative	**Negatively valenced verbal strategies delivered directly to the target in an attempt to affect the behavior of the target, and which identify the specific alcohol-related problem to be addressed**
Command-Simple	Agent tells target to alter his or her behavior in some way but provides no reason or justification for intervention *Ex: You are not driving! I will drive!* *I will not let you drink any more!*
Command-Complex	Agent tells target to alter his or her behavior and provides reasons or justifications for intervention *Ex: You are too drunk, so I am going to drive.* *I'm driving. You'll get in an accident if you drive.*
Verbal Threat	Agent threatens target with some form of negative punishment if he or she does not comply *Ex: Give me the keys or I'll kick your...* *If you drive, I'm not going with you.*
Authority	Agent invokes his or her role-related power to insure target's compliance *Ex: I am the designated driver. I'll take you home.*
Negative Altercasting	Agent states that, if the target does not comply, she or he will be perceived in a negative fashion *Ex: Don't be an idiot.*

Table 1 (cont.)

Intervention Strategies Employed in Alcohol-Related Situations

Strategy Type/ Tactic Type	Definition/Example
Behavioral	**Positively or negatively valenced nonverbal strategies employed to affect the behavior of the target**
Prevent	Agent takes an action which prevents target from engaging in destructive behavior *Ex: Agent takes keys from target.* *Agent takes drinks away from target.*
Physical Force	Agent uses physical force to prevent target from engaging in the behavior *Ex: Agent grabs target and throws him or her in the back seat. Agent hits target.*
Indirect	**Verbal strategies which attempt to affect the behavior of the target but which do not identify the specific alcohol-related problem to be addressed**
Stall	Agent suggests an alternative action that will put off target's behavior until a later time *Ex: Let's stay a little longer...* *Why don't you sleep here tonight and go home in the morning?*
Redirect	Agent attempts to prevent the target's behavior by suggesting an alternative course of action that will redirect the target's behavior away from the problem situation *Ex: It's such a nice night. Let's walk. Jump in my car. We can come back and get your car in the morning.* *Let's not go out drinking tonight.*

Table 1 (cont.)

Intervention Strategies Employed in Alcohol-Related Situations

Strategy Type/ Tactic Type	Definition/Example
Indirect	
Liking	Agent acts nicely towards target and attempts to prevent behavior by capitalizing on target's attraction to agent. *Ex: I'd like to walk tonight. Will you go with me? I'd rather just stay in and be alone with you tonight.*
Talk to Others	Agent talks to other people about the target's problem. *Ex: I think ... needs help. I don't think .... should drive tonight.*
Observe	Agent tells target that she or he will watch the target for a period of time. *Ex: If you don't mind, I'll follow you home tonight. Why don't we stay together tonight.*
Target Initiates	Agent responds to a question from the target concerning his or her behavior *Ex: Do you think I should drive (target)? Do you think I have a problem with alcohol (target)?*

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Table 2

Target Responses to Intervention Strategies

Response	Definition/Example
Compliance	**Target accepts assistance from the agent and/or complies with the agent's request** *Ex: Okay, I'll let you drive. Yes. I'll stop drinking and get some help.*
Delay	**Target attempts to avoid responding to the agent** *Ex: Target ignores or does not answer agent. Target promises to change at a later date. Target lies about staying. Target puts off agent until a later time.*
Denial	**Target verbally or nonverbally indicates to the agent that he or she does not have a problem** *Ex: I'm not drunk. I haven't had that much to drink. See, I'm sober (walks a straight line).*
Refusal	**Target does not explicitly deny the existence of a problem but refuses any assistance from the agent** *Ex: No, I am driving. Quit nagging me.*
Hostility	**Target becomes overtly hostile (physically or verbally) with the agent** *Ex: Target physically attacks agent (e.g., pushes out of way). Target ridicules or makes fun of agent. Target yells or screams at agent.*

Table 3

Reasons for Intervention Success Attributed by Agents

Reason	Definition/Example
Message	**Agent attributes success of intervention attempt to characteristics associated with the message employed** *Ex: I kept a serious tone. I used forceful communication. I was able to get the keys away from him or her. I threatened the target. I met the concerns of the target. I made the target feel stupid. I deceived the target.*
Relationship	**Agent attributes success of intervention attempt to the strength of the relationship between the agent and the target** *Ex: The target knew I was his or her friend. The target knew that I cared about him or her. The target trusted me.*
Situation	**Agent attributes success of intervention attempt to the target's knowledge/awareness of the seriousness of the situation** *Ex: The target knew how bad things were getting. The target knew that he or she might get into trouble with the police (or school) if the behavior continued*
Source	**Agent attributes success of intervention attempt to the target's perception of the power or expertise of the source** *Ex: Target knew I was in better condition to drive. Target accepted my position of authority.*
Target	**Agent attributes success of intervention attempt to the qualities or beliefs of the target** *Ex: Target was aware of how bad his or her condition was. Target did not believe people should drive drunk.*

Table 4

Reasons for Intervention Failure Attributed by Agent

Reason	Definition/Example
Message	**Agent attributes failure of intervention attempt to characteristics associated with the message employed** *Ex: I did not meet the concerns of the target. I was not able to get the keys away from the target. Target saw my attempts as an insult. My communication was not forceful enough.*
Relationship	**Agent attributes failure of intervention attempt to the weakness of the relationship between the agent and the target** *Ex: I was not close enough to the target. The target did not see me as a friend.*
Situation	**Agent attributes failure of intervention attempt to factors in the situation** *Ex: Target wanted to get home immediately. Target did not want anyone driving his or her car. Target had driven intoxicated before without any trouble.*
Source	**Agent attributes failure of intervention attempt to characteristics associated with him or herself.** *Ex: I was too drunk.*
Target	**Agent attributes failure of intervention attempt to the qualities or characteristics of the target** *Ex: Target was too stubborn or arrogant to listen. Target was too ignorant to know how bad his or her condition was. Target was older or bigger.*

Table 5

Number and Percentage of Strategies/Tactics Used and Number and Percentage of Successful Strategies/Tactics in the Drunk Driving Intervention Situation

Strategy Type/ Tactic Type	Use		Success	
	n	%	ns	%s
Direct Positive	**321**	**40**	**76**	**24**
Request-Simple	113	14	20	18
Request-Complex	186	23	42	23
Persuasion	22	3	14	64
Direct Negative	**273**	**34**	**88**	**32**
Command-Simple	119	15	39	33
Command-Complex	96	12	16	17
Verbal Threat	20	2	15	75
Authority	14	2	7	50
Neg Altercasting	24	3	11	46
Behavioral	**97**	**12**	**58**	**60**
Prevent	84	10	53	63
Physical Threat	13	2	5	38
Indirect	**115**	**14**	**51**	**44**
Stall	23	3	6	26
Liking	25	3	0	0
Redirect	64	8	43	67
Talk to Friend	1	0.1	1	100
Observe	2	0.2	1	50
Target initiates	--	--	--	--
Total	**806 Used**		**273 (34%) Successful**	

Table 6

Percentage of Strategies/Tactics Used in Each Drunk Driving Intervention Attempt

Strategy Type/ Tactic Type	Intervention Attempt #1 (n = 351)	#2 (n = 285)	#3 (n = 133)	#4 (n = 37)
Direct Positive	**52**	**34**	**25**	**22**
Request-Simple	23	8	4	8
Request-Complex	27	24	16	11
Persuasion	2	2	5	3
Direct Negative	**33**	**32**	**43**	**27**
Command-Simple	17	10	20	14
Command-Complex	14	12	8	8
Verbal Threat	1	4	4	5
Authority	0.3	2	5	0
Neg Altercasting	1	4	7	0
Behavioral	**6**	**15**	**11**	**43**
Prevent	6	14	8	35
Physical Threat	0.3	1	4	8
Indirect	**9**	**19**	**21**	**8**
Stall	2	5	2	0
Liking	0.3	0	0	0
Redirect	6	14	18	8
Talk to Friend	0.3	0	0	0
Observe	0	0	2	0
Target initiates	0	0	0	0

Table 7

Percentage of Strategies/Tactics Used for Agent-Target Gender Pairings in the Initial Drunk Driving Intervention Attempt

Strategy Type/ Tactic Type	Agent-Target Gender Pairings M-M (n = 128)	F-M (n = 128)	M-F (n = 16)	F-F (n = 79)
Direct Positive	**42**	**60**	**50**	**54**
Request-Simple	22	23	25	25
Request-Complex	20	35	25	25
Persuasion	1	2	0	4
Direct Negative	**42**	**27**	**25**	**29**
Command-Simple	21	16	25	13
Command-Complex	17	11	0	15
Verbal Threat	2	1	0	0
Authority	0	0	0	1
Negative Altercasting	3	0	0	0
Behavioral	**4**	**6**	**19**	**8**
Prevent	4	6	19	6
Physical Threat	0	0	0	1
Indirect	**12**	**6**	**6**	**9**
Stall	3	1	0	4
Liking	1	0	0	0
Alternative Suggestion	8	5	6	5
Talk to Friend	0	1	0	0
Observe	0	0	0	0
Target Initiates	0	0	0	0

Table 8

Percentage of Target Responses in Each Drunk Driving Intervention Attempt

	Intervention Attempt			
	#1	#2	#3	#4
Response Type				
Denial	62	23	10	6
Refusal	19	24	20	12
Hostility	0.3	2	2	6
Delay	1	1	3	0
Compliance	17	48	66	76

Table 9

Percentage of Strategies/Tactics Reported as Successful in Each Drunk Driving Intervention Attempt

	Intervention Attempt			
Strategy Type/ Tactic Type	#1 (n = 351)	#2 (n = 285)	#3 (n = 133)	#4 (n = 37)
Direct Positive	**16**	**33**	**55**	**68**
Request-Simple	18	19	20	50
Request-Complex	13	31	52	68
Persuasion	50	100	86	100
Direct Negative	**17**	**47**	**69**	**60**
Command-Simple	20	46	74	60
Command-Complex	7	24	50	68
Verbal Threat	100	80	60	50
Authority	0	75	80	0
Neg Altercasting	0	68	84	0
Behavioral	**56**	**82**	**85**	**85**
Prevent	63	86	78	91
Physical Threat	0	0	100	50
Indirect	**15**	**58**	**67**	**100**
Stall	0	42	100	0
Liking	0	0	0	0
Redirect	17	64	64	100
Talk to Friend	100	0	0	0
Observe	0	0	100	0
Target initiates	0	0	0	0

Table 10

Number and Percentage of Strategies/Tactics Used and Number and Percentage of Successful Strategies/Tactics in the Alcohol Abuse Intervention Situation

Strategy Type/ Tactic Type	Use		Success	
	n	%	ns	%s
Direct Positive	**114**	**69**	**26**	**23**
Request-Simple	15	9	0	0
Request-Complex	78	47	23	29
Persuasion	21	13	3	14
Direct Negative	**33**	**20**	**12**	**36**
Command-Simple	2	1	1	50
Command-Complex	18	11	7	39
Verbal Threat	2	1	1	50
Authority	2	1	1	50
Neg Altercasting	9	5	2	22
Indirect	**17**	**11**	**5**	**28**
Stall	--	-	--	--
Liking	--	--	--	--
Redirect	11	7	5	45
Talk to Friend	1	1	0	0
Observe	0	0	--	--
Target initiates	5	3	0	0
Total	**165 Used**		**43 (26%) Successful**	

*-- indicates that the strategy was not used

Table 11

Percentage of Strategies/Tactics Used in Each Alcohol Abuse Intervention Attempt

Strategy Type/ Tactic Type	Intervention Attempt #1 (n = 96)	#2 (n = 54)	#3 (n = 11)	#4 (n = 4)
Direct Positive	**68**	**72**	**54**	**100**
Request-Simple	8	7	0	75
Request-Complex	46	56	27	25
Persuasion	14	9	27	0
Direct Negative	**22**	**15**	**36**	**0**
Command-Simple	1	2	0	0
Command-Complex	14	4	27	0
Verbal Threat	0	2	0	0
Authority	0	2	9	0
Neg Altercasting	6	6	0	0
Behavioral	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**
Prevent	0	0	0	0
Physical Threat	0	0	0	0
Indirect	**10**	**13**	**9**	**0**
Stall	0	0	0	0
Liking	0	0	0	0
Redirect	3	13	9	0
Talk to Friend	0	0	0	0
Observe	0	0	0	0
Target initiates	5	0	0	0

Table 12

Percentage of Target Responses in Each Alcohol Abuse Intervention Attempt

	Intervention Attempt			
	#1	#2	#3	#4
Response Type				
Denial	47	31	0	100
Refusal	9	31	67	0
Hostility	7	2	0	0
Delay	4	6	11	0
Compliance	33	31	22	0

Table 13

Percentage of Strategies/Tactics Reported as Successful in Each Alcohol Abuse Intervention Attempt

Strategy Type/ Tactic Type	Intervention Attempt #1 (n = 96)	#2 (n = 54)	#3 (n = 11)	#4 (n = 4)
Direct Positive	**29**	**28**	**20**	**0**
Request-Simple	0	0	--	0
Request-Complex	40	29	50	--
Persuasion	11	50	0	--
Direct Negative	**45**	**33**	**25**	--
Command-Simple	100	0	--	--
Command-Complex	50	0	33	--
Verbal Threat	100	0	--	--
Authority	--	100	0	--
Neg Altercasting	17	50	--	--
Indirect	**50**	**57**	--	--
Stall	--	--	--	--
Liking	--	--	--	--
Redirect	50	57	--	--
Talk to Friend	--	--	--	--
Observe	--	--	--	--
Target initiates	--	--	--	--

*-- indicates that the strategy was not used